Testimony
of
Gerald Tumbleson
President
National Corn Growers Association

Before the

House Agriculture Committee

Longworth House Office Building
Room 1300
Washington, DC

September 20, 2006

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Peterson and members of the Committee, on behalf of the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA), I want to thank you for this opportunity to share our member's views on the 2002 Farm Bill and provide input for the writing of the 2007 Farm Bill.

My name is Gerald Tumbleson. I farm with my wife and two sons in southern Minnesota, where we produce corn, soybeans and hogs. I currently serve as president of NCGA.

The National Corn Growers Association represents more than 32,000 corn farmers from 48 states. NCGA also represents more than 300,000 farmers who contribute to corn check off programs and 26 affiliated state corn organizations across our country, working together to create new opportunities and markets for corn growers.

America's corn producers continue to make a significant and important contribution to our nation's economy. Over the last five years, the nation's corn crop has averaged 10.3 billion bushels resulting in an annual average farm gate value of almost $22 billion. The relatively stable production over the past ten years, made possible by innovation in production practices and technological advances, has helped to ensure ample supplies of corn for livestock, an expanding ethanol industry, new biobased products, and host of other uses in the corn industry. Moreover, investments by the American taxpayer in our nation's agriculture programs have helped to produce a more stable financial environment for production agriculture and a brighter future for our rural communities. In our view, reliable, abundant, affordable and safe supplies of grain for the food on our tables to the fuel in our cars are generating benefits many times over for our national economy.

Commodity Programs

I must emphasize that the farm safety net provided in the commodity title of the 2002 Farm Bill and its predecessors is considered a critical component of most producer' risk management plans. The changes to farm support programs adopted in May of 2002 have proven to be more effective in delivering assistance to farmers when it is most needed; during periods of low commodity prices, adverse weather conditions and crop disease. The new counter-cyclical payments combined with direct payments and the marketing assistance loan program has enhanced producers' ability to make long term business decisions, including investments in ethanol production and other agriculture value-added opportunities.

Another important part of the farm safety net is the federal crop insurance program. Due in large part to additional resources authorized by Congress in 2000 and improvements in revenue coverage, the program has experienced a substantial increase in enrolled acreage and the average level of protection for both traditional multi-peril crop and revenue based policies. Many of our members, however, continue to express concern that federal crop insurance remains too costly or provides insufficient protection. Because of the diverse production conditions across the Corn Belt, NCGA urges the committee to advance policy changes to expedite the research and development of enhanced revenue based products or innovative program options that may better match the risk management needs of farm operations not adequately served by the crop insurance policies available today.

While the 2002 Farm Bill has performed well for most corn growers, NCGA has noted in previous hearings a serious flaw or what some economists have referred to as a "hole" in the safety net. First, for producers who have sustained large crop losses or repetitive years of shallow losses during the recent years of record harvests and low prices, the combined support of fixed direct payments, marketing loan deficiency payments and countercyclical payments have provided insufficient income protection, even with the purchase of crop insurance coverage at higher levels. Secondly, growers who have found themselves in isolated areas of drought or other adverse weather conditions and unable to fully benefit from higher market prices, cannot look to countercyclical payments to lessen the adverse impact of lost income and the drain on their financial assets. Third, NCGA remains concerned about the traditional formula of crop disaster assistance in current and past legislation which does little to fill these gaps in today's farm safety net. By redirecting payments for losses already covered by federal crop insurance to a portion of uninsured losses, we believe reforms proposed by Rep. Sam Graves, in the Companion Disaster Assistance Program Act, H.R. would provide a more effective, sensible delivery of aid without compromising the objectives of our federal crop insurance program.

In anticipation of last year's budget reconciliation and development of a new farm bill, NCGA decided to undertake a careful review and analysis of the farm safety net. Under the current structure, the distribution of support from direct payments, loan deficiency payments, and counter-cyclical payments appears to be relatively balanced over time.

Looking forward, however, changes in the corn industry, particularly an expanding ethanol industry, suggest a significant reduction in price based support from loan deficiency payments and countercyclical payments. Projections for corn and other commodity markets by the Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute and other experts have underscored the need for NCGA and several affiliated state associations to investigate alternative safety net concepts for our members' consideration.

Based on input we have gathered and the work of our public policy team, NCGA has developed a preliminary proposal for a revenue based safety net that our initial analysis indicates more effective net farm income protection factoring in price, yield and variable production expenses. Two new programs, Base Revenue Protection (BRP) and Revenue Countercyclical Program (RCCP), would work in a complementary fashion and compensate producers when market revenue declines below target levels. BRP provides coverage against declines in farm-level crop net income. RCCP builds on this base and provides protection against declines in revenue measured at the county level, similar to Group Risk Income Protection (GRIP) in federal crop insurance.

Briefly, BRP guarantees that a grower's per-acre crop-specific net revenue would not fall below 70 % of the previous five year Olympic average of per-acre net revenue on a farm. The actual per-acre net revenue in any one year would be calculated by multiplying the actual farm level yield by a national market price and subtracting the variable costs of production estimated by the Economic Research Service. A producer would then receive assistance if his net revenue falls below the guarantee. RCCP payments would be triggered whenever the actual county revenue falls below the county revenue guarantee. The county guarantee under NCGA's initial proposal is set at 100 percent of the product of the effective target price (target price less direct payment of crop) and the expected county yield. The actual county revenue is determined using the season average price and National Agency of Statistical Services (NASS) county yield. Because RCCP and BRP are a package of programs, the maximum payment for RCCP is capped when the actual county revenue falls to 70 % of the county revenue guarantee.

Coupled with the current fixed direct payments and a recourse marketing loan program, BRI and RCCP would establish a more effective safety net structured to transfer considerable trade distorting support into a program exempt from WTO domestic support limits. In fact, BRP is designed to meet current WTO rules for income insurance and safety-net programs in the Green Box while the RCCP fits within the Amber Box. This reform, alone, could potentially offer greater flexibility for other agriculture support spending reported as Amber Box Support. Our revenue based concept remains a work in progress, but NCGA is committed to reaching out to the other commodity groups to address their concerns as we further refine our proposal for your consideration.

As important as an adequate safety net is to America's farmers, NCGA views commodity programs to be strongly linked to revitalizing our rural communities. We urge the committee to carefully consider the proven programs in the Rural Development Title that are better leveraging our farm support resources for locally owned agriculture based investments. The experience of our members indicate programs such as direct value-added producer grants, loan guarantees for renewable fuels projects and investments in rural infrastructure stimulate economic development generating a wide range of benefits for rural areas. By providing new sources of capital and engaging farmers in value-added processing, production and marketing, the Rural Development Title can help enhance farm profitability and creation of new jobs. Unfortunately, we have seen these cost effective programs and other important rural development initiatives in the 2002 Farm Bill impacted by reduced funding and in a number of cases, no funding at all. If we are to continue the progress in building a more prosperous economy and a better quality of life in Rural America, NCGA believes that the next farm bill can serve as an engine of growth for new business opportunities.

Conservation and Stewardship

Another top priority for NCGA is an agriculture policy that recognizes and promotes the best available practices by farmers to further improve our environment. When President Bush signed the farm bill into law on May 13, 2002, he stated at the signing ceremony: "For farmers and ranchers, for people who make a living on the land, every day is Earth Day. There are no better stewards of the land than people who rely on the productivity of the land." We commend Congress, particularly this Committee, and the Administration for providing a strong emphasis on conservation in the 2002 farm bill, especially on working lands.

Corn growers are very concerned with the health and well-being of American citizens and are mindful of the need to balance environmental stewardship with the need for a long-term, dependable food supply and necessity for long-term profitability in farming. We support the use of sound science to set environmental policy and the use of voluntary programs to assist farmers in meeting environmental goals.

Farmers are making important environmental gains through the use of farm bill conservation programs – we see that in reduced soil erosion, improved water quality, and increased wildlife habitat. Likewise, we support efforts to measure the real results of the conservation practices we've implemented. We applaud the collaborative work thus far on the Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP) to scientifically assess the environmental outcomes from farm bill conservation programs and determine benefits from conservation practices and programs. The ability to develop understandable and relevant performance measures and communicate them to the public will help shape future public and congressional support for farm programs.

Looking Ahead to 2007

In anticipation of upcoming farm bill conservation policy deliberations, NCGA's Production and Stewardship Action Team commissioned research of recent National Resources Inventory (NRI) data, concentrating on sites with a history of corn production. The goal of this research is to determine the level of conservation practices and production practices nationwide that growers have implemented to conserve soil and limit erosion. We are working to identify the remaining conservation practices that might be adopted on corn producing lands to properly address remaining conservation challenges.

For example, initial exploration of NRI data show increases in farm bill conservation title investments to conservation tillage in areas where appropriate may hold the potential for the single largest gains in further reducing erosion from corn lands. Additionally, the overlap between energy conservation, conservation tillage and Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) own emphasis on improving growers' energy conservation practices all point toward possible and successful initiatives in the next farm bill.

We understand tight budgetary constraints will be a major issue with the 2007 Farm Bill. While each of the conservation programs utilized by corn growers could benefit from more funding to increase efficiencies, enrollment opportunities, and environmental gains, any increase in funding should not come at the expense of the farm safety net (Title I programs). In general, we recommend that the farm safety net should be enhanced with conservation programs but not replaced by conservation programs.

As is the case with many farm bill titles (conservation, research, rural development, energy, etc.), programs that are authorized but never funded are of no help. Likewise, programs that are deprived during the appropriations process never reach their full potential. For example, altering support levels to the 2002 farm bill conservation programs has caused unnecessary disruption across the farming community, and we do not recommend this practice in the 2007 farm bill. Corn growers do not support the notion of one conservation program funded at the expense of another, or Title II funded at the expense of Title I.

Farm Bill Conservation Programs

Regarding the future of conservation programs, many of our members have expressed concern with how the current programs are being implemented on the state and local level. Many believe their knowledge and expertise are ignored and not wanted. They believe they are essentially shut out of state technical committees, which as a result are dominated by paid professionals who usually do not have the farmer's best interest at heart. Our members also are discouraged by backlogs in funding and seemingly arbitrary funding decisions.

Technical Assistance

The demand for technical assistance continues to increase. Yet, funding for technical assistance has been relatively flat over the years. In general, we recommend the next farm bill provide adequate funding for NRCS field staff to help address conservation challenges on-farm. We encourage the Committee to look at a long-term view of budgeting for technical assistance that balances national priorities with local needs.

Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

The Conservation Reserve Program is one of the most important and widely used conservation programs for corn growers. NCGA supports the full utilization of CRP at its maximum authorized level and the President's goal of sustaining the environmental benefits of the program.

Current NCGA policy endorses the targeted enrollment and reenrollment of the most environmentally sensitive land, such as field borders and filter and buffer strips, and other areas needed for conservation compliance. These targeted areas should be allowed to be managed in such a manner that would not disrupt the normal management of the entire field. Corn growers also recommend the voluntary enrollment of filter strips under the continuous enrollment provision of CRP.

NCGA supports maintaining an equitable balance among soil erosion, water quality and wildlife benefits. However, the program should have flexibility to address local concerns as well. For example, in some parts of the country, it is very difficult to achieve cost-effective wildlife benefits.

NCGA strongly supports the use and further development of state-based Conservation Reserve Enhancement Programs (CREP) as they bring together a broad group of interest to address specific, local concerns. However, CREP's popularity has resulted in an over-subscription of available funds.

We support a CRP that pays adequate and fair rental rates and allows farmers to bring land back into production at the end of their contract if they desire. However, rental rates should be reviewed by USDA to ensure that payments for whole field enrollments do not exceed county average rental rates for similar land capability classes.

Corn growers also have heard concerns from our partners in the conservation community regarding land use implications of dedicated energy crops, especially since increasing land areas for this purpose could affect marginal and ecologically sensitive areas (wetlands, wildlife habitat) and CRP lands. Along with research and development of increased ethanol production capabilities, we encourage this Committee to consider how farm bill conservation programs can mitigate potential unintended consequences in this regard.

Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program is very popular and delivers effective conservation program dollars to assist landowners who face natural resource challenges on their land. Above all, EQIP should preserve the full flexibility needed to adjust the program over time to focus on evolving issues and allow improvements to program features based on national, state and local needs.

NCGA continues to support the requirement that 60% of EQIP funds be directed to livestock-related conservation practices. Likewise, we support the environmentally sound use of manure and the use of incentive payments to producers who develop Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans (CNMPs). CNMPs are sound investments that help ensure livestock effluent is managed responsibly.

However, EQIP should be made available to livestock and poultry facilities without bias to size or location. The intent of Congress was to help all livestock producers cope with the costs imposed by current and emerging local, state, and federal environmental regulations; however, those producers who manage the majority of total livestock in the United States have not had access to the program.

In addition, limiting EQIP's water quality priority to solely address non-point source pollutants misses the intent of the 2002 farm bill. For example, the National Pork Producers Council has cited in previous comments on EQIP that approximately 80% of all the hogs produced in the United States – and therefore 80% of all the hog manure produced by these operations – could be classified by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as point sources. In order to improve water quality nationwide, we encourage the Committee to clarify that the program must also provide assistance to help those that produce and manage the majority of animals and manure.

While most of the technical issues addressed by EQIP concern water quality improvement, most of the public perception problems and citizen opposition concern odor. NCGA encourages the use of EQIP funds for odor control systems for livestock operators.

However, NCGA does not support EQIP as a funding source for endangered species protection, especially when other, more effective and well-funded financial assistance programs within the Department address at-risk species habitat recovery, including the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program.

Conservation Security Program (CSP)

The Conservation Security Program continues to be a work in progress. Since its enactment, seven legislative actions on the CSP statue have resulted in funding changes creating a range of implementation challenges. As a result, a number of corn growers have expressed frustration with the continuous changes in the application process, describing it as a moving target. Funding stability is needed in order to fully appreciate the impact of the program.

NCGA supports environmental incentive payments for implementation of conservation practices. The agency's approach of rewarding both existing practices and encouraging the adoption of additional practices with corresponding incentive payments is a positive aspect of the program. We encourage this Committee to review program requirements that phase out the early adopter of conservation enhancements to ensure that this is not counterproductive to "rewarding the best."

Congress should reiterate the need to ensure that enrollment categories and subcategories are fairly and consistently applied to all farmers across the nation. While NCGA is generally supportive of granting states flexibility in implementing conservation programs, the Committee should consider additional oversight mechanisms to manage how states interpret and disseminate information about the program. Inconsistent application of conservation laws, programs and standards can have the unintentional effect of helping one farmer while hurting another, thus diluting environmental benefits.

Very few NCGA members have control of all of the land they farm for the length of time prescribed by CSP. Most corn growers rent land on an annual basis, and the size and make up of their operations vary from year to year. Some states have founds ways around the land control requirements in the program, however, a national, uniform standard should be in place to address this concern. Corn growers recognize the challenges associated in addressing the program's approach to rental lands and will work with the Committee and USDA to find a solution.

Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)

Moving beyond the "no net loss" of agricultural wetlands to have an overall increase in wetland acres each year is a direct result of the work farmers and ranchers have done to create, maintain or enhance wetlands. According to USDA, the greatest gain in wetland acres has occurred in the Corn Belt and Delta States. WRP can help continue to create, improve and protect millions of wetland acres but the program is oversubscribed in many key areas of the nation.

Energy

While the 2002 Farm Bill is often noted for authorizing a record level of conservation program funding, the legislation was the first in history to contain a separate energy title, reflecting a fundamental policy linking of agriculture to energy. Title IX of the Farm Bill established new programs and grants for procurement of biobased products to support development of biorefineries; to educate the public about benefits of biodiesel fuel use; and to assist eligible farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses in purchasing renewable energy systems.

As this committee moves forward with writing the next farm bill, it is important for you to know the high level of support for an Energy Title that emphasizes opportunities for growth in renewable fuels production, building new markets for biobased products, and investments in value-added agriculture businesses. NCGA advocates farm bill policies and programs reflective of the current market and rising demand for renewable fuels. It is our view that the next farm bill can be developed to play an even more valuable role in shaping the future of the renewable fuels industry and reducing the country's dependence on foreign energy supplies.

I would like to highlight a few key provisions from the 2002 Farm Bill that have been beneficial to our corn grower members. However, without adequate funding, these programs cannot be successfully implemented.

First, the Value-Added Agricultural Product Market Development Grants provision makes competitive grants available to assist with feasibility studies, business plans, marketing strategies, and start-up capital. Many farmer-owned ethanol and biodiesel plants have utilized this program. Moreover, with more ethanol plants coming online many rural communities are seeing stronger economies and increased development.

Additionally, the Federal Procurement of Biobased Products provision established a new program requiring the purchase of biobased products by federal agencies. This program has promoted the growth of biobased consumer goods and has created another value-added arena for commodities like corn. NCGA continues to believe this program requires more attention at the federal level and support for incorporating biobased chemicals into the parameters of the program.

The Biorefinery Development Grants program provides federal grants to ethanol and biodiesel producers who construct or expand their production capacity. The 2002 farm bill authorized funding for this program but no money has been appropriated. In today's expanding energy market and a growing demand for homegrown fuels, federal initiatives to support biofuel expansion and increased capacity would be a welcome benefit for producers.

Another competitive grant program, Biodiesel Fuel Education, was established for facilitating education of government and private organizations with vehicle fleets, as well as the public, on the benefits of biodiesel fuel use. In step with this program, NCGA supports expansion of this program to better inform agencies and other groups about the benefits of ethanol and E85 fuel. Again, the potential benefits of these programs are lost without proper funding and continued federal support.

Additionally, the Renewable Energy Systems and Energy Efficiency Improvements Section, which created a loan guarantee, and grant program to assist eligible farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses in purchasing renewable energy systems and making energy efficiency improvements has proven useful in some communities. This program can serve as key asset in expanding renewable energy use and mitigating the adverse impact of rising fuel costs on farm income.

Lastly, the 2002 Farm Bill reauthorized the Bioenergy CCC Program and broadened the list of eligible feedstocks. This program which expired June 30 of this year, required the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments through the Commodity Credit Corporation to eligible producers to encourage increased purchases of eligible commodities to expand production of bioenergy and support new production capacity. Overall, this program has been helpful in encouraging expansion and stimulating capacity growth, but there is room to restructure this program to be more inclusive of other feedstocks.

As U.S. agriculture becomes a major player in domestic energy production, research and development will be critical in diversifying the nation's energy portfolio. Our next farm bill should provide direct investment into ethanol and biofuel research and development. For instance, R&D investments in ethanol production technology could have a very positive long term economic impact while immediately decreasing dependence on imported oil. Examples of R&D investment opportunities include improving production and utilization of animal feed, co-production of biobased chemicals, utilization of corn kernel fiber, and reducing natural gas use in ethanol plants. Today, the federal biomass research program is focused on long-term cellulose research. Cellulose research is one of several potential strategies to increase ethanol production and will need a steady stream of R&D dollars to reach its full potential.

NCGA expects each of these programs to produce significant opportunities for rural economic development, energy diversification, and environmental quality. Clean energy development provisions in the farm bill are providing a new income stream for farmers and ranchers as well as creating new jobs. As we work together to craft the next farm bill, we encourage members of the committee to carefully consider the successes and lessons learned from these programs. U.S. farmers and the towns where we live are excited about the possibilities of producing more renewable energy for our country.

Trade

The Farm Bill also authorizes two programs, the Market Access Program (MAP) and Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program (FMD), which play integral roles in overall U.S. efforts to further agricultural trade. These programs promote U.S. agriculture products, including corn and value-added corn products, in important foreign markets.

The trade of corn and its value-added products is essential to the profitability of U.S. corn farmers. According to the USDA Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS), the U.S. exported almost $4.8 billion of corn during 2005. Additionally, exports of value-added products such as beef, pork and chicken totaled over $6.7 billion during the same year.

The Market Access Program and Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program

NCGA supports both an increase in the funding cap for MAP and a higher level of minimum funding for FMD in the 2007 farm bill. Rural American farmers and ranchers, as the primary suppliers of commodities benefit from MAP. In addition, all regions of the country benefit from the program's employment and economic effects from expanded agricultural export markets. Each year, both of these programs help launch and expand sales of U.S. agricultural, fish, and forest products overseas. However, the most recent FAS data focusing on market development programs similar to MAP and FMD in other countries showed competitors' total spending (government and private sector) exceeded that in the United States by nearly a 4 to 1 ratio during 2002.

MAP uses funds appropriated by Congress to: encourage the development, maintenance, and expansion of commercial agricultural export markets; stimulate and increase interest of small companies in exporting; open new markets; counter unfair foreign competition; and increase commercial sales of U.S. agricultural products. MAP forms a partnership between non-profit U.S. agricultural trade associations, U.S. agricultural cooperatives, non-profit state-regional trade groups, small U.S. businesses, and USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) to share the costs of overseas marketing and promotional activities such as consumer promotions, market research, trade shows, and trade servicing.

The FMD Program, also known as the Cooperator Program, uses funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation to create, expand, and maintain long-term export markets for U.S. agricultural products. The Cooperator program has fostered a trade promotion partnership between USDA and U.S. agricultural producers and processors who are represented by nonprofit commodity or trade associations called Cooperators. Under this partnership, USDA and the Cooperators pool their technical and financial resources to conduct overseas market development activities.

These programs help to build international markets for important corn co-products such as distiller's dried grains with solubles (DDGS). Without these programs, it would be difficult to conduct the feeding trials and education programs that help lead to increased DDGS demand in countries such as Mexico. For instance, the results of a feeding trial conducted in Veracruz, Mexico, are used to promote this ethanol co-product at national and regional trade shows. DDGS demand in Mexico increased 269 percent in recent years, moving from approximately 28,000 metric tons in 2002 to 104,294 metric tons in 2005.

Similarly, these programs are creating new opportunities for American farmers in Chinese markets. MAP and FMD fund technical and managerial training to assist in the modernization of China's feed and livestock industries. As these industries expand, their grain demand increases, diverting Chinese corn that might otherwise have been sold on the international market in competition with U.S. feed grains. The effect of these programs is evidenced by increased domestic corn prices in China and the government's decision not to renew corn export quotas since February.

Trade Promotion Authority

Finally, NCGA strongly supports reauthorization of Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) for the President. Our mission is "to create and increase opportunities for corn growers". TPA ensures that an administration has the necessary tools to negotiate good trade agreements for U.S. agriculture. TPA plays an essential role in the success of multilateral trade negotiations, which create and increase opportunities for American corn growers through improved market access for corn and value-added products. Improved foreign market access results in better prices for our growers.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I have been known to say more than a few times that the world is short two things: energy and protein. NCGA is working toward a farm bill to help address this challenge in a changing world and to tap the full potential of our agriculture economy and rural communities as well as provide a stronger safety net for our producers, young and old. We are eager to work with you in the months ahead to advance a farm bill that will ensure United States agriculture is equipped to supply this changing world as we look to the future. NCGA recognizes the difficult task ahead for you and appreciates your steadfast support.

Committee on Agriculture
U.S. House of Representatives
Required Witness Disclosure Form

House Rules* require nongovernmental witnesses to disclose the amount and source of Federal grants received since October 1, 2004.

Name: Gerald Tumbleson

Address: 1705 40th Ave., Sherburn, MN 56171

Telephone: (507) 639-6938

Organization you represent (if any): National Corn Growers Assoc.

1. **Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) <u>you</u> have received since October 1, 2004, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract. House Rules do <u>NOT</u> require disclosure of federal payments to individuals, such as Social Security or Medicare benefits, farm program payments, or assistance to agricultural producers:**

Source: See attached. **Amount:** ______

Source: ______ **Amount:** ______

2. **If you are appearing on behalf of an organization, please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) <u>the organization</u> has received since October 1, 2004, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract:**

Source: ______ **Amount:** ______

Source: ______ **Amount:** ______

Please check here if this form is NOT applicable to you: ______

Signature: Gerald Tumbleson

* Rule XI, clause 2(g)(4) of the U.S. House of Representatives provides: *Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by any entity represented by the witness.*

PLEASE ATTACH DISCLOSURE FORM TO EACH COPY OF TESTIMONY.

Awarded Federal Grants

3/10/2005

NCGA Project	Grant Title	NCGA Lead Staff	Branch of Government/ Project Mgr.	WBS#	Federal Identification # (CID#)	Total $ Amount	Award Time Frame	Other Institutions Involved (company, people, contact info)	NCGA Cost Share (Matching Requirement)	NCGA Overhead Revenue from Grant Award	Reporting Requirements
Fiber Project	Seperation o	Nathan Fields	DOE Frank Baumgardt (303.275.4772)	5.1.1.1	GO13147	2,351,474.00	4 years Oct. 02 to June. 06	ADM (Kyle Beery), PNNL (Rick Orth)	1933478 (285,431.00)	0	1/4ly Status Narratives; budget expectations; SF 269
Esters Project	Reactive Dist	Nathan Fields	DOE Becky Wall	4.2.4.1	GO14249	934,747.00	3 years 10/03 - 9/06	Michigan State University (Dennis Miller) Nexant Chem systems (Ron Castone)	258,251	~40K	1/4ly Status Narratives; budget expectations; SF 269
E-Diesel	E-Diesel Res	Nathan Fields	DOE Becky Wall	4.1.2.3	GO14216	982,000.00	10/03-09/06	Illinois Corn Growers Association (Phil Shane) DCEO (Norm Marek) SWRI (Bill Mitchell)	245,500	0	1/4ly Status Narratives; budget expectations; SF 269
Distillers Solubles Nutrient Blocks	Development	Nathan Fields	USDA Martin Fee (785.271.2730)			175,000.00	10/04-6/06	Kansas State University (Jim Drouillard) Frazier Barnes & Assoc. (Rodney Frazier)			6 month status Narrative; SF 269
Water Quality		Lisa Kelley	EPA			75,000.00	2 years				
Biotech Best Practices	Best Practice	Paul/Nathan	USDA/APHIS	?	?	29,435	1 year	?	n/a	n/a	?

Committee on Agriculture
U.S. House of Representatives
Information Required From Non-governmental Witnesses

House rules require non-governmental witnesses to provide their resume or biographical sketch prior to testifying. If you do not have a resume or biographical sketch available, please complete this form.

1. **Name:** Gerald Tumbleson
2. **BusinessAddress:** 1705 40th Avenue
   Sherburn, MN 56171
3. **Business Phone Number:** (507) 639-6938
4. **Organization you represent:** National Corn Growers Association
5. **Please list any occupational, employment, or work-related experience you have which add to your qualification to provide testimony before the Committee:**

   See attached.

6. **Please list any special training, education, or professional experience you have which add to your qualifications to provide testimony before the Committee:**

   See attached.

7. **If you are appearing on behalf of an organization, please list the capacity in which you are representing that organization, including any offices or elected positions you hold:**

   See attached.

PLEASE ATTACH THIS FORM OR YOUR BIOGRAPHY TO EACH COPY OF TESTIMONY.

National Corn Growers Association
www.ncga.com

Gerald Tumbleson
President

Gerald Tumbleson serves as President of the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA), a producer-directed trade association headquartered in St. Louis, Missouri, with a second office in Washington, DC. Its mission is to create and increase opportunities for corn growers.

Gerald farms in Martin County, raising corn and soybeans, and feeding hogs. Gerald and his wife Joanne live on the same farm where Gerald was born and raised. He has served on several local co-op boards, has been a volunteer county ditch viewer, served on the Harvest States Resolutions Committee, and was a member of the local Jaycees, serving as the chapter's president. Gerald is a graduate of the University of Minnesota, and has a degree in Soil Science and Animal Husbandry. He is involved as a lay speaker in his church, where he has served as chair of the church board. As a member of the NCGA Corn Board, Gerald has served as liaison to the Production and Stewardship Action Team, representative to the U.S. Grains Council, and was appointed to serve as NCGA representative to the National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research.

Gerald and Joanne have three married sons, Trace, Thad and Trent. Thad is a school teacher in Mahtomedi, MN, and Trace and Trent farm with their parents.

NCGA is a federation of state organizations, corn boards, councils and commissions, which develops and implements policies and programs on a state and national level to help protect and advance the corn producer's interests. NCGA represents nearly 33,000 individual members in 46 states. NCGA has 26 state affiliated corn grower associations and 20 state checkoff boards that it works with directly.